

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 5/1/2007. Claims 1-3, 6 and 18-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6 and 8-14 are rejected. Claim 1 has been amended by this response. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection, *Mikhailov***

Claims 1-3, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Mikhailov et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,500) (hereinafter "*Mikhailov*"). Applicants respectfully submit that *Mikhailov* does not disclose each element of these claims. For example, Applicants' claim 1 as amended recites a metadata validation system for validating an object model, the system comprising:

- a client device configured to receive user input and provide a user interface to a user;
- a database for storing objects corresponding to the object model and metadata describing the object model;
- a configuration management module for creating a deployable collection of objects using the object model; and
- a validation engine for validating the metadata in the database by applying one or more validation rules on the metadata**, wherein said validation engine is configured to perform completeness validation applying a completeness validation rule on a first validation subject in response to a user entered command to perform validation on the validation subject, to automatically perform correctness validation applying a correctness validation rule on a second validation subject when the subject is created or updated, and to automatically perform completeness and correctness validation on a validation subject when requested by the configuration management module. (*emphasis added*).

Such limitations are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*. Rather, *Mikhailov* discloses an automatic forms handling system, where the service definition may be saved as metadata in the database table associated with that form. (*Mikhailov*, col. 14, lines 63-64). Moreover, forms engine **validates form submissions**. (*Mikhailov*, col. 10, lines 55-56). The **service definition may specify special submission handling instructions, such as an instruction to email each submission to the form publisher for review before entering the submissions into the database table**. (*Mikhailov*, col. 5, lines 43-47). FIG. 11 of *Mikhailov* illustrates this "special submission handling instruction." Routine 1028 follows step 1024 shown in FIG. 10. In step 1102, the forms engine queries the metadata of the database table to determine if the form publisher 22 review is required before recording the data submission. If the form publisher 22

review is not required, the "NO" branch of step 1102 is followed to step 1110. In step 1110, the forms engine proceeds to record the submission into the database table that corresponds to the published form. After step 1110, the routine returns to step 1032 of FIG. 10. If the form publisher 22 review is required, the "YES" branch of step 1102 is followed to step 1104. In step 1104, the submission data is e-mailed to the form publisher 22 for review. Step 1104 is followed by step 1106, in which the forms engine 12 determines if the form publisher 22 has approved the data submission for recordation. If the form publisher 22 has approved the data submission, the "YES" branch of step 1106 is followed to step 1110. In step 1110, the forms engine proceeds to record the submission into the database table that corresponds to the published form. After step 1110, the routine returns to step 1032 of FIG. 10. If the form publisher 22 has not approved the data submission, the "NO" branch of step 1106 is followed to step 1108. In step 1108, the forms engine determines whether a revised submission has been received. If a revised submission has not been received, the "NO" branch is followed, and the routine returns to step 1032 of FIG. 10. If a revised submission has been received, the "YES" branch is followed to step 1110. In step 1110, the forms engine proceeds to record the revised submission into the database table that corresponds to the published form being utilized. After step 1110, the routine returns to step 1032 of FIG. 10. (*Mikhailov*, col. 15, line 59 - col. 16, line 7).

It is asserted in the office action that the metadata, as recited by claim 1, is taught by the service definition specifying form logic of *Mikhailov*. (Office Action p. 6). It is also asserted that *Mikhailov* discloses two ways of validating the metadata. First, "querying the metadata of the database" to determine if form publisher review is required and second, "to determine if a revised submission has been received."

Applicants respectfully disagree. As to the first assertion, for purposes of argument, even if the service definition is regarded as the metadata, as suggested, *Mikhailov* fails to disclose validating the metadata **by applying one or more validation rules on the metadata (service definition)**. There is no mention of applying any type of validation rule on the service definitions. Querying the service definitions to determine if the form publisher review is required does not amount to applying a validation rule on the service definition. The service definition itself is a requirement which includes instructions to carry out the requirement, such as

**"an instruction to email each submission to the form publisher for review before entering the submissions into the database table."** The form engine queries the service definition to determine the presence or absence of this instruction. After the engine determines that this instruction is a part of the metadata (service definition), it executes this instruction. There is no mention of applying any type of validation rule on this instruction. In fact, the validity of the instruction is not being checked. It is merely the presence or absence of the instruction that is being determined. Accordingly, *Mikhailov* does not disclose **validating the metadata by applying one or more validation rules on the metadata**, as is claimed by Applicants.

Moreover, the second assertion which claims that determining if a revised submission has been received is a way of validating the metadata also fails. *Mikhailov* discloses that when publisher review is required by the service definition, various instructions are executed to carry out the requirement; *Mikhailov* discloses submitting an email to the publisher, waiting for the publisher approval, and waiting for a revised submission. (*Mikhailov*, Fig. 11). Even if the service definition is regarded as the metadata, waiting for a revised submission does not amount to applying any type of validation rule on the service definition (metadata). After the service definition has been queried and the presence of the requirement for publisher approval is determined, there is no further interaction with the service definition itself. The instructions, such as waiting for a revised submission, merely carry out the requirement of publisher approval that was specified in the service definition. Again, the validity of the service definition is not being determined. More specifically, the validity of the requirement for publisher approval is not challenged in any way and is merely carried out. Accordingly, *Mikhailov* does not disclose **validating the metadata by applying one or more validation rules on the metadata**, as is claimed by Applicants.

As such, *Mikhailov* cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 8 and 14 recite limitations that similarly are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*, and further disclose meta metadata objects, as discussed above, which are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*, such that *Mikhailov* cannot anticipate claims 8 and 14, or the claims that depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to the pending claims be withdrawn.

### **III. Amendment to the Claims**

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Naya Chatterjee-Marathe/

Naya Chatterjee-Marathe  
Reg. No. 54,680

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
NMC:pas  
61055978 v1